

## REMARKS

Claims 1 - 20 are pending in the instant patent application.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS

### 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1 - 8, 11, 12, and 14 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Cognos White Paper, "Constructing the Integrated Data Warehouse with Cognos e-Applications", Sept 2000, pp. 1-19 (herein after Cognos) in view of Cawse Us Patent 6,725,183. Applicants respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in the present Claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the references, either alone or together in combination.

Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach the elements of Claim 1. The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1, which recites in part that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a method of presenting an analysis of enterprise wide business data, comprising:

a) in response to a user request to a web site operable to access said enterprise wide business data and to provide statistical analysis of

said enterprise wide business data, transferring an electronic document to said user, wherein said electronic document *allows said user to select a performance measure to be analyzed (emphasis added)* for a data set in said enterprise wide business data;

b) in response to a request from said user, performing a statistical analysis of said *performance measure (emphasis added)*; and

c) transferring an electronic copy of said statistical analysis to said user.

To the extent the Cognos reference may mention a number of *packaged* reports [Page 8] in a star structure which allows users to drill down [Page 11 column 1 paragraph 4], Applicants respectfully assert that the Cognos reference does not teach or suggest, in response to a user request to a website allowing the *user to select a performance measure to be analyzed* for a data set in the enterprise wide business data; and in response to a request from the user, performing a statistical analysis of the performance measure.

To the extent the Cognos reference may mention a users choice of a *web browser*, and whether the user is LAN based or working remotely [page 17 col.2 paragraph2], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach in response to a user request *to a web site*. Applicants respectfully assert merely mentioning a *web browser* does not teach accessing a web site.

To the extent the Cognos reference may mention the e-Applications Console has parameters that reflect changes between the Cognos and SAP, Oracle or J.D.Edwards

*source system* [page 16 column 1 paragraph 4], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach selecting a *performance measure*.

The present Office Action acknowledges the Cognos reference does not teach providing an electronic document providing an electronic document provided by a website on the network where users can use to access the data warehousing applications. The present Office Action takes Official Notice alleging that using a website that using a website that utilizes electronic documents to provide client/server/browser applications such as taught by Cognos is old and well known in the art. To the extent the Cognos reference may mention a users choice of a web browser, whether the user is LAN based or working remotely [page 17 col.2 paragraph2], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach in response to a user request *to a web site*. Applicants respectfully assert it is not well known in response to a user request to a web site operable to access the enterprise wide business data and to provide statistical analysis of the enterprise wide business data, transferring an electronic document to the user, wherein the electronic document allows the user to select a performance measure to be analyzed for a data set in the enterprise wide business data. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide authority for the assertion of Official Notice.

The present Office Action acknowledges the Congos reference does not teach where the analysis is statistical in nature. Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Cognos reference. To the extent the Cawse reference may mention for any process (business, manufacturing service, research etc.) [Col. 1 lines 50 – 55] and goes on to indicate use of DFSS techniques in any *research project* is relevant to the invention of Cawse [Col. 9 lines 15 – 20], Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference does not teach in response to a user request to a website allowing the *user to select a performance measure to be analyzed* and in response to a request from the user performing a statistical analysis of the *performance measure*.

Applicants respectfully assert Claims 2 – 10 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent Claim 1.

With respect to Claims 2, 3, and 4 the present Office Action acknowledges the Cognos reference does not teach transferring a Hyper-Text Markup Language document comprising the statistical analysis in histogram format; overlaying on the histogram an indicator of a statistical mean and an indicator of a user specified target limit; and highlighting the area of the histogram outside of

the user specified target limit, wherein the relative number of defects are graphically visible, respectively The present Office Action takes Official Notice alleging that providing HTML documents using the client/server/browser architecture as taught by Cognos is old and well known in the art. To the extent the Cognos reference may mention a users choice of a web browser, whether the user is LAN based or working remotely [page 17 col.2 paragraph2], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach and it is not well known to transfer a Hyper-Text Markup Language document comprising the statistical analysis in histogram format; overlay on the histogram an indicator of a statistical mean and an indicator of a user specified target limit; or highlight the area of the histogram outside of the user specified target limit, wherein the relative number of defects are graphically visible. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide authority for the assertion of Official Notice.

With respect to Claim 5, the present Office Action acknowledges the Cognos reference does not teach in response to an electronic request from the user, running a simulation to determine the effect varying a user specified statistical parameter of a plurality of statistical parameters has on another statistical parameter; and electronically transferring the results of the simulation to the user, wherein the user is presented a graphical display providing

information to assist in quality improvement. Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Cognos reference.

To the extent the Cawse reference may mention highly nested Design of Experiment's (DOE's) [Col. 8 lines 10 -15], Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference does not teach in response to an electronic request from the user, running a simulation to determine the effect varying a user specified statistical parameter of a plurality of statistical parameters has on another statistical parameter. To the extent the Cawse reference may mention, as shown in Figure 16 using the DOE techniques resulted in focusing attention on the autoclave temperature capability, Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference does not teach electronically transferring the results of the simulation to the user, wherein the user is presented a graphical display providing information to assist in quality improvement.

With regards to Claim 6, the present Office Action acknowledges the Cognos reference does not teach the plurality of statistical parameters comprise statistical mean, standard deviation, a user specified target, actual percentage of data above and below the user specified target, and sigma value. Applicants

respectfully assert the Cawse reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Cognos reference. To the extent the Cawse reference may show or mention a chart, a mean, a standard deviation [Figure 14], Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference does not teach the plurality of statistical parameters comprise statistical mean, standard deviation, a user specified target, actual percentage of data above and below the user specified target, and sigma value.

With respect to Claim 7, the present Office Action alleges Cognos teaches in response to a user request, determining a trend of a statistical parameter over time and electronically transferring a document comprising a display of the trend. To the extent the Cognos reference may mention *users must* be able to answer which customers in the western sales reation have increased their purchases by more than 30 percent [page 6 Col. 2 paragraph 1], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach *in response to a user request*, determining a trend of a statistical parameter over time.

The present Office Action acknowledges the Cognos reference does not teach statistical parameters are trended and does not teach conveying information using a Hyper-Text Markup Language document. The present

Office Action takes Official Notice alleging that a website utilizes electronic documents (allegedly HTML pages) to provide client/server/browser applications as taught by Cognos is old and well known in the art. To the extent the Cognos reference may mention a users choice of a web browser, whether the user is LAN based or working remotely [page 17 col.2 paragraph2], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach and it is not well know to in response to a user request, determining a trend of a statistical parameter over time; and electronically transferring a Hyper-Text Markup Language document comprising a display of the trend. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide authority for the assertion of Official Notice.

To the extent the Cawse reference may mention a day to day drift [Col. 7 line 50 – 55], Applicant respectfully asserts the Cawse reference does not teach response to a user request, determining a trend of a statistical parameter over time; and electronically transferring a Hyper-Text Markup Language document comprising a display of the trend. In addition, to the extent the Cawse reference may mention a day to day *drift*, Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference *teaches away* from a *trend*.



With respect to Claim 8, the present Office Action alleges the Cognos and Cawse references teach the trend displaying a statistical parameter as discussed in the present Office Action. Applicants respectfully reassert the arguments presented above.

With respect to Claim 11, the present Office Action alleges Claim 11 addresses limitations addressed by the rejections of Claims 1 – 8 above except for where the database comprise business data. To the extent Claim 11 is similar to Claim 1 – 8 Applicants respectfully reassert the arguments presented above and respectfully assert Cognos does not teach the present invention. To the extent the Cognos reference may mention extracting data from operational or transactional systems and e-commerce systems and installing it in a database [page 2 col.2], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach a database comprising business data from across an enterprise and a computer system operable to access the database, to perform a statistical analysis of the business data, to receive user-generated requests via the Internet for execution of a user-defined statistical analysis of a user selected performance measure.

Applicants respectfully assert Claims 12 – 14 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent Claim 11.

With respect to Claim 12, the present Office Action acknowledges the Cognos and Cawse reference does not teach providing information using an HTML document to a user. The present Office Action takes Official Notice alleging that using a website that using a website that utilizes electronic documents to provide client/server/browser applications such as taught by Cognos is old and well known in the art. To the extent the Cognos reference may mention a users choice of a web browser, whether the user is LAN based or working remotely [page 17 col.2 paragraph2], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach respond to an electronically transferred request from an Internet node to perform a statistical simulation, and to electronically transfer a Hyper-Text Markup Language document comprising the results of the statistical simulation, wherein a user is allowed to view a web-page which displays the statistical simulation. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide authority for the assertion of Official Notice.

With respect to Claim 14, the present Office Action alleges Claim 4 addresses limitations addressed by the rejections of Claim 4 above. To the extent Claim 14 is similar to Claim 14, Applicants respectfully reassert the arguments presented above and respectfully assert Cognos does not teach the present invention.

With respect to Claim 15, the present Office Action alleges Cognos and Cawse teach the limitations above in Claim 1 and alleges Cognos teaches providing selectable data fields to the user for the user to select a plurality of dimensions. To the extent Claim 15 is similar to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully reassert the arguments presented above and respectfully assert Cognos does not teach the present invention. To the extent the Cognos reference may mention a fact table is linked to several dimension tables [page 11 col.1 paragraph 3], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach wherein the electronic document has selectable fields for a plurality of dimensions to select a data set accessible by the host computer system and in response to a user-generated request received from the peripheral computer for a statistical analysis of a user selected performance measure for the data set.

Applicants respectfully assert Claims 16 – 20 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent Claim 15.

With respect to Claim 16, to the extent the Cognos reference may mention data comes from back office EPR systems, front office and e-business sources [page 1 Col. 2 paragraph 4], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference

does not teach collecting the data from a plurality of databases. To the extent the Cognos reference may mention the transformation process will reject records that don't satisfy business rules [page 12 Col. 2 paragraph 2], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach formatting the data in a single format, wherein data from multiple databases in multiple formats is converted to a single format and stored on a single database. In addition, to the extent the Cognos reference may mention depending upon the platform and database, you will have to vary the way you install and configure your solution [page 6 Col. 1 paragraph 4], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference teaches away from formatting the data in a single format, wherein data from multiple databases in multiple formats is converted to a single format and stored on a single database. To the extent the Cognos reference may mention opting to build either data warehouses or data marts {page 2 Col. 2 paragraph 3}, Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach wherein the peripheral computer system does not have direct access to the databases.

With respect to Claim 17, the present Office Action alleges the Cognos and Cawse references teach the limitations of Claim 1. To the extent Claim 1 is similar to Claim 17, Applicants respectfully reassert the arguments presented above and respectfully assert Cognos and Cawse references do not teach the

present invention. To the extent the Cognos reference may mention a web browser and LAN [page 17 Col. 2 paragraph 2], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach a standardized presentation of the statistical analysis is available to multiple distributed peripheral computer systems.

With respect to Claim 18, the present Office Action acknowledges the Cognos reference does not teach formatting the statistical analysis in graphical format, wherein the variance of the data set is graphically viewable. Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Cognos reference. To the extent the Cawse reference may show or mention a graph [Figure 14], Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference does not teach formatting the statistical analysis in graphical format, wherein the variance of the data set is graphically viewable.

With respect to Claim 19, the present Office Action acknowledges the Cognos reference does not teach the step of highlighting data points which are outside of a target range, wherein the relative number of defective data are viewable. Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Cognos reference. To the extent the Cawse reference may show or mention a graph [Figure 14], Applicants respectfully assert the Cawse reference does

not teach step of highlighting data points which are outside of a target range, wherein the relative number of defective data are viewable.

With respect to Claim 20, the present Office Action alleges Claim 20 addresses limitations addressed by the rejections of Claim 5 above. To the extent Claim 20 is similar to Claim 5, Applicants respectfully reassert the arguments presented above.

Claims 9, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Cognos White Paper, "Constructin trhe Integraed Data Warehouse with Cognos e-applications", Sept 2000, pp. 1-19 (herein after Cognos) in view of Cawse US Patent 6, 725,183 and further in view of Hsuing US Patent 6,853,923. Applicants respectfully assert US Patent 6,853, 923 does not list Hsuing as an Inventor. In an effort to advance the prosecution, Applicants are responding to the Hsuing reference US Patent 6,853,920 previously cited in prior Office Actions. Applicants respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in the present Claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the references, either alone or together in combination.

With respect to Claim 9, to the extent the Cognos reference may mention

an ETL system should flag errors and incorporate best warehousing practices [page 6 Col. 1 paragraph 3], Applicants respectfully assert the Cognos reference does not teach the present invention. The present Office Action acknowledges the Cognos reference does not teach as new data is added to the business data, determining if a statistical parameter for the performance measure is outside a user specified target; and automatically notifying the user if the step d) is true, wherein the notification comprises an electronically delivered message to a user specified node. Applicants respectfully assert the Hsuing reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Cognos reference.

To the extent the Hsuing reference may mention acquiring subsequent data from the source at a second time and statistical techniques applied to previously collected data [Col. 16 lines 5 -10 and lines 55 – 59], Applicants respectfully assert the Hsuing reference does not teach as new data is added to the business data, determining if a *statistical parameter* for the *performance measure* is outside *a user specified target*.

To the extent the Hsuing reference may mention a third descriptor predicted by the model indicates failure of a pump [Col. 16 lines 40 – 45], Applicant respectfully asserts the Hsuing reference does not teach automatically

notifying the user if the step d) is true, wherein the notification comprises an electronically delivered message to a user specified node.

With respect to Claim 10, to the extent the Cognos reference may mention a financial analysis e-Application speeds period end closings for balance sheets and income statements [page 8 Col. 1 paragraph 1 -2], Applicants respectfully asserts the Cognos reference does not teach *analyzing* the *performance measure* according to a *periodic rate specified* by the *user*.

With respect to Claim 13, the present Office Action alleges Claim 13 addresses limitations addressed by the rejections of Claim 9 above. To the extent Claim 13 is similar to Claim 9, Applicants respectfully reassert the arguments presented above and respectfully assert Cognos does not teach the present invention.




### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants respectfully assert that the pending claims in the instant patent application are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application and allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' designated representative at the below listed phone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 10/10/07 2007

  
John F. Ryan  
Registration No. 47,050

Address: MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile